

Application/Control Number: 09/821,423  
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3575

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. No claims are amended.

#### Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 18-20

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,608,850 to Robertson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,089 to Murray. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of record selection. The method includes, among other things, recognizing a contact point on a display upon which physical contact is made with the display and marking a first start point on a first record entry. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Robertson, at col. 13, lines 35-45 discloses a mouse pointer displacement being used to select objects.

Robertson, at col. 23, lines 35-45, discloses:

A signal from a user input device indicates selection of a location sensitive display object, or indicates a position in an image, if the signal includes data from which the display object or position can be uniquely identified. For example, if a signal includes data indicating a mouse pointer displacement, a system can find a point in the display plane based on the previous pointer position. This point can then be used to project a ray from the viewpoint into the 3D workspace being presented, and the coordinates of display objects in the workspace can be used to find the nearest display object intersected by the ray.

Thus, Robertson discloses a signal input may include a mouse pointer displacement. The displacement and the previous pointer position may be used to project a ray. Coordinates of display objects in a workspace can be used to find a nearest display object intersected by a ray.

Robertson, at col. 1, lines 43 discloses:

The system user interacts with—that is, performs operations on—displayed 2D graphical objects, such as icons, menus, and dialog boxes, using a pointing device.

In other words, Robertson discloses that displayed 2D graphical objects, or display objects, include graphical objects, icons, menus, and dialog boxes. Thus Robertson discloses that

Application/Control Number: 09/821,423  
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3575

coordinates of display objects (i.e., graphical objects, icons, menus, and dialog boxes) in a workspace can be used to find a nearest display object intersected by a ray. However, a display object is not equivalent to a record entry. Therefore, Robertson fails to disclose or suggest recognizing a contact point on a display upon which physical contact is made with the display and marking a first start point on a first record entry. Murray also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson. Therefore, Robertson and Murray fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in any combination, recognizing a contact point on a display upon which physical contact is made with the display and marking a first start point on a first record entry.

Further, as discussed above, Robertson is concerned with display objects and not record entries and therefore, Robertson fails to disclose or suggest, either separately or in any combination with Murray, recognizing a contiguous displacement of the contact point on the display horizontally across the first record entry to a first end point, as also recited in claim 1. . Again, Murray fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson. In addition, because Robertson is concerned with selecting display objects and not record entries, Robertson does not disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with Murray, automatically selecting the first record entry provided the first distance exceeds a distance delta, as also recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a computer system and recites features similar to those of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 18 and dependent claims 19-20 are patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1 and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 18-20 be withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 09/821,423  
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3575

#### **Rejection of Claims 4 and 21**

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Murray. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claims 4 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 21 be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 5 and 22**

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Murray and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,167 to Michaels. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claims 5 and 22 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 18. Michaels fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson and Murray. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 22 be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 6 and 23**

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 23 as allegedly being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Murray and Michaels and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,474 to Johnson, Jr. et al. ("Johnson"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claims 6 and 23 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1

Application/Control Number: 09/821,423  
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3575

and 18. Michaels and Johnson fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson and Murray.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6 and 23 be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 7-11 and 24-28**

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-11 and 24-28 as allegedly being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Murray, in further view of Michaels, and in further view of Chester et al., "Mastering Excel 97, 1997, Sybex, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, pages 66-67 ("Chester"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 1 and claims 24-28 depend from claim 18. Claims 7-11 and 24-28 are patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 18. Michaels also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson and Murray. Chester discloses how to select a range of cells in a spreadsheet application. However, cells in a spreadsheet application are not record entries as required by the claims. Applicants submit that Chester does not satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson, Murray, and Michaels. Therefore, Applicants submit that Robertson, Murray, Michaels, and Chester do not disclose or suggest, separately or in any combination, all of the features of claims 7-11 and 24-28. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7-11 and 25-28 be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 12-13**

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Murray, and further in view of Michaels. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that claim 12 is similar to claim 1 and is patentable over Robertson in view of Murray for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Michaels

Application/Control Number: 09/821,423  
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3575

fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Robertson and Murray. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and is patentable over Robertson, in view of Murray, and further in view of Michaels for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Having addressed the rejection of claims 1 - 28, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 27, 2005

By: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address:

Cust. No. 49632  
Berry & Associates, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
Phone: (310) 247-2860  
Fax: (310) 247-2864

Richard C. Irving  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,499  
Phone: 410-414-3056